

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on 08 April 2008 was received and reviewed. Claims 1, 7, 21-24, 27-31, and 37-43 are amended; claims 5-6, 12-14, 25-26, and 32-36 are canceled; and claims 3-4 and 23-24 are withdrawn. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks and above amendments is respectfully requested.

Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks examiners Tung and Amin for granting the personal interview on 24 June 2008 and for considering the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 21, and 41-43 and the arguments regarding the deficiencies of the prior art, including Jaguar. Examiner Amin stated that the proposed amendments appear to overcome the prior art. However, Examiner Amin stated after a formal response is filed, further consideration is necessary to determine whether the amended claims are allowable over the prior art. Applicant's representative encourage Examiner Amin to contact Applicant, if the filed amendments fail to overcome the anticipation rejection in view of Jaguar.

Restriction

Applicant confirms election Fig. 2 corresponding to claims 1, 2, 5-22 and 25-48 without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application to pursue non-elected claims 3-4 and 23-24.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

A.) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. § 101 states “ [w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.”

B.) Non-statutory Subject Matter Rejection.

Claims 21-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 21-40 are statutory subject matter.

Claims 21-40 are amended to recite computer-storage media as described in Applicant's specification at pages 8-9. A computer storage media falls within the statutory classes identified in 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 21-40 are not directed to any of the judicially-created exceptions. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 of claims 21-40.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A.) Applicable Authority

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir.1989). *See also*, MPEP §2131.

B.) Anticipation Rejection Based on OS X v 10.2; release date August 24, 2002 ("Jaguar").

Claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jaguar. Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44 because Jaguar fails to describe all elements of amended independent claims 1 and 44.

Amended independent claim 1 is a method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A composting desktop window manager (CDWM) receives application content from advanced applications in a bottom-to-top order to display the application content received in a bottom-to-top order in windows corresponding to the advanced applications in the graphical user interface. A desktop window manager (DWM) receives application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface. Application content received from the legacy applications are stripped and converted to a graphical representation. The operating system switches between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content and displays at least a portion of the application content in an opaque content portion of the windows, where the windows have translucent frame portions.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy*

applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content; as recited in amended independent claim 1. The Office relies upon Jaguar to anticipate the invention of claim 1. The cited portions describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. Nothing in Jaguar describes, among other things, switching between a DWM and CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of amended independent claim 1, requires among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; and switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 1 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1, dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As such,

withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 44 is a computer operating system that uses a composited desktop rendering model that provides legacy support for applications compatible only with an invalidation desktop rendering model. An instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM). In turn, client content is stripped from the legacy window information and converted to a raster image. The compositing desktop window manager (CDWM) draws a window to a buffer memory, wherein the CDWM renders the window by applying a texture to a mesh that comprises the raster image of the client content and default non-client information.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe, among other things, *an instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM); stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content*; as recited in independent claim 44. The Office relies upon Jaguar to anticipate the invention of claim 44. The cited portions describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. Nothing in Jaguar describes, among other things, the interaction between a legacy DWM and CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of independent claim 44, requires among other things, an instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM); stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements of the invention of independent claim 44.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of independent claim 44.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A.) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. §103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some reason, or suggestions or motivations found either in the prior art references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to produce the claimed invention. See *Application of Bergel*, 292 F. 2d 955, 956-957 (CCPA 1961). Recently, the Supreme Court elaborated, at pages 13-14 of the *KSR* opinion, it will be necessary for [the Office] to look at interrelated teachings of multiple [prior art references]; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by [one of] ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the [patent application].” *KSR v. Teleflex*, No. 04-1350, 550 U.S. ____ (2007).

B.) Obviousness Rejections Based on Jaguar.

Claims 21, 25-36, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claim 21.

Amended independent claim 21 is computer storage configured to perform a method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A composting desktop window manager (CDWM) receives application content from advanced applications in a bottom-to-top order to display the application content received in a bottom-to-top order in windows corresponding to the advanced applications in the graphical user interface. A desktop window manager (DWM) receives application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface. Application content received from the legacy applications are stripped and converted to a graphical representation. The DWM redirects received application content to the CDWM, which renders the advanced application content and legacy application content and displays at least a portion of the application content in an opaque content portion of the windows, where the windows have a translucent frame portions.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the*

stripped application content to a graphical representation; as recited in amended independent claim 21. The Office relies upon Jaguar to render the invention of claim 21 unpatentable. The cited portions describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. Nothing in Jaguar describes, teaches, or suggests, among other things, redirecting application content from the DWM to the CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of amended independent claim 21, requires among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 21.

Dependent claims 27-31 and 39 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 22 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from amended independent claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 21, dependent claims 27-31, 36, and 39 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 27-31, and 39 are respectfully requested.

C.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar in view of US Patent Publication No 2003/0107570 ("Solazzi").

Claims 18, 38 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar in view of Solazzi. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claims 1, 21, 43, and 43.

Claims 18 and 38 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 21, respectively. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 18 and 38 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Solazzi fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 18 and 38.

Amended independent claim 42 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where the displaying further comprises rendering reflective content on the frame portion based on other discrete content separate from the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in amended independent claim 42. The Office relies upon Jaguar and Solazzi to render the invention of claim 42 unpatentable. The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. Nothing in Jaguar or Solazzi, alone and in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content from the CDWM in reverse z-order.

Unlike Jaguar and Solazzi, the invention of amended independent claim 42, requires among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Jaguar and Solazzi, alone and in combination, fails to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 42. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 42.

Amended independent claim 43 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the

application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering refractive content on the frame portion based on other discrete content behind the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in amended independent claim 43. The Office relies upon Jaguar and Solazzi to render the invention of claim 42 unpatentable. The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. Nothing in Jaguar or Solazzi, alone and in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content from the CDWM in reverse z-order.

Unlike Jaguar and Solazzi, the invention of amended independent claim 43, requires among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Jaguar and Solazzi, alone and in combination, fails to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 43. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 43.

D.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and Solazzi in view of Technology Terminology, Mike Whitman, May 13, 2001 (Whitman).

Claims 17, 37, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar, in view of Solazzi, and further in view of Whitman. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claims 1, 21, and 41.

Claims 17 and 37 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 17 and 37 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Solazzi and Whitman fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 17 and 37.

Amended independent claim 41 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Application content to display in a window is received; and at least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering spectral highlights on the frame portion based on a virtual light source by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, *receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency,*

shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping, as recited in amended independent claim 41. The Office relies upon Jaguar, Solazzi, and Whitman to render the invention of claim 41 unpatentable. The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. The cited portions of Whitman provide term definitions. Nothing in Jaguar, Solazzi, or Whitman, alone and in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content from and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Jaguar, Solazzi, and Whitman, the invention of amended independent claim 41, requires among other things, receiving application content and a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping for windows that display the application content. Jaguar, Solazzi, and Whitman, alone and in combination, fail to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 41. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 41.

E.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and U.S. Patent No. 6,980,209 (Donham).

Claims 2 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar and Donham. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21.

Claims 2 and 22 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended independent claims

1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 2 and 22 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Donham fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 22. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 2 and 22.

F.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0030997 ("Farrah"), and U.S. Patent No. 4,694,404 (Meagher).

Claims 20, 40, and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar, Farrah, and Meagher. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claims 1, 21, and 44.

Claims 20 and 40 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 22. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 20 and 40 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Farrah and Meagher fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 22. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 20 and 40.

Independent claim 45 is a method for resizing a window defined in part by a mesh. The mesh is divided into three regions per mesh dimension. In turn, for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, *dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window*, as recited in independent claim 45. The Office relies upon Jaguar, Farrah, and Meagher to render the invention of claim 41 unpatentable. The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Farrah describe generating a grid. The cited portions of Meagher describes generating a 3-D image from a 2-D image. Nothing in Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, alone or in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests, among other things, *dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension*.

Unlike Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, the invention of independent claim 45, requires among other things, *dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window*. Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, alone or in combination, fail to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of amended independent claim 45. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 45.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-2, 7-11,15-22, 27-31, and 37-48 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing attorney docket no. MFCP.140739.

Respectfully submitted,

/MONPLAISIR HAMILTON/

Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

TLW/mghz
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550